

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 243

SP 034 265

AUTHOR Lang, Harry G.; And Others
TITLE Characteristics of Effective Teachers: A Descriptive Study of Perceptions of Faculty and Deaf College Students.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; College Faculty; *College Students; *Deafness; Department Heads; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Perspective Taking; Research Needs; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS National Technical Institute for the Deaf

ABSTRACT

The goal of the study described here is to develop a research agenda for more in-depth analyses of the relation certain teaching characteristics may have to student outcomes. Rating and ranking scales were designed and administered to examine perceptions about teaching characteristics held by administrators, academic department chairpeople responsible for evaluating teaching, instructional faculty, and deaf college students. The differences in perceptions between supervisors and teachers about characteristics of effective teaching indicate a need for ongoing dialogue, particularly prior to and following classroom observations. In addition, teachers and deaf college students are found to differ in their views of the importance of certain characteristics; discussion with students about these perceptions is suggested. Additional research on particular characteristics of effective teaching based on the findings of this study are recommended. A reference list and five data tables are appended. (Author/LL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED353243

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Lang

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1

Characteristics of Effective Teachers: A Descriptive Study of Perceptions of Faculty and Deaf College Students

Harry G. Lang

Barbara G. McKee

Department of Educational Research and Development

Karen Conner

School of Business Careers

National Technical Institute for the Deaf

Rochester Institute of Technology

Rochester, New York

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association
Convention, San Francisco, April, 1992.

Running Head: Effective Teaching

SB34265

Abstract

Rating and ranking instruments were designed and administered to examine the perceptions about teaching characteristics held by administrators, academic department chairpeople responsible for evaluating teaching, instructional faculty, and deaf college students. The differences in perceptions between supervisors and teachers about characteristics of effective teaching indicate a need for ongoing dialogue, particularly prior to and following classroom observations. In addition, teachers and deaf college students are found to differ in their views of the importance of certain characteristics and discussion with students about these perceptions is suggested. The authors also recommend additional research on particular characteristics of effective teaching based on the findings of this study.

Characteristics of Effective Teachers: A Descriptive Study of Perceptions of Faculty and Deaf College Students

Although much research has been conducted on the teaching process in classrooms for hearing students over the past forty years, the same cannot be said about the systematic study of teaching in academic settings for deaf students. Few original investigations of characteristics of effective teachers of deaf students have been published, and studies with hearing students have been seldom replicated. A significant amount of research on characteristics of deaf learners completed over the past two decades, however, suggests that some learning traits of deaf students may differ from those of hearing students. The question of whether different learning characteristics may imply a need for a different set of teacher characteristics bears further investigation.

Various studies have shown that teachers who remain abreast of research findings may receive enhanced student ratings and other studies have shown that, if given the appropriate information, teachers can change their behaviors. McLean (1979) found that faculty initially ranked as poorer teachers in her investigation showed significant performance changes following mid-term feedback, indicating teachers with specific teaching weaknesses may at least improve their student ratings through increased awareness of these characteristics. Murray (1985) also concluded from his study that student perceptions of teaching effectiveness will improve when teachers increase the frequency of specific behaviors. More research is needed, however, to determine how lasting the effect of student feedback may be on such changes in teaching behaviors. The results of a number of research studies suggest that students from different disciplines do not perceive effective teaching in the same way (Sheffield, 1974). That student ratings of certain characteristics such as

teacher humor, enthusiasm, and course structure vary across disciplines, or even within a discipline, as Donald (1986) has found, implies that teachers and/or students may actually use different criteria to judge teaching effectiveness in specific situations.

As a first step toward the examination of specific teaching characteristics and their relationship to student achievement, it is important to identify which characteristics faculty perceive as effective, and whether the perceptions of their students and supervisors are similar or different. In addition, the extent to which these teaching characteristics match those identified in studies with faculty who primarily teach hearing students would be useful knowledge.

The present study has as its purpose a general description of how faculty and their deaf college students view characteristics of effective teachers. The specific goal is to develop a research agenda for more indepth analyses of the relation certain teaching characteristics may have to student outcomes. This study of perceptions is conducted in two contexts. First, general comparisons of the perceptions of college faculty and students are made through the administration of rating and ranking scales. Second, we examine the individual perceptions of 20 faculty "cohorts" and compare them with those of their chairpersons, who evaluate their teaching, as well as with the perceptions of their students, who rate their instruction.

Design and Procedure

Twenty college teachers were selected for a cohort group from a large pool of teaching faculty. Stratified sampling was used to have approximately equal representation by hearing status (11 deaf, 9 hearing), sex (10 male, 10 female), and academic discipline. The faculty cohorts were promised anonymity in

regard to the information they provided in individual interviews with two of the co-investigators. During the interviews, the teachers were asked to describe the assumptions they have made about deaf learners and how these assumptions have led to specific teaching strategies. The goal of the interviews was to encourage the teachers to think about the qualities inherent in their instruction and to identify specific characteristics they considered important in their repertoire, whether they had reached a level of comfort with these characteristics or not. Through discussion, it was agreed that "teaching effectiveness" would be defined primarily in terms of enhanced student learning and achievement. The assumptions, strategies, and teaching characteristics identified during the interview were summarized and returned to each teacher, who was asked to identify and rank order the three characteristics considered most important to his/her effective teaching. This resulted in a list of 60 characteristics, which was subsequently reduced to 32 when similar characteristics were combined.

To study the general perceptions of college faculty and deaf students about each of these 32 characteristics, a six-point Likert scale was designed. The relative importance placed on these characteristics was examined through a ranking procedure which required the respondent to choose the ten characteristics considered most important to effective teaching of deaf students and then rank the top three. Both the rating and ranking surveys were distributed to the Dean, six Assistant and Associate Deans, 19 chairpeople of academic departments, and the 20 faculty cohorts. A stratified sampling was employed to select 120 teaching faculty who did not participate in the interviews. Sixty were asked to respond to the rating scale and 60 were invited to rank the characteristics. In addition, the rating and ranking scales were alternately administered to a sample of 334 deaf college students who were

registered in the courses taught by the 20 faculty cohorts. The students were unaware that their teachers were participating in the study and were asked to consider college teachers in general when responding to the items.

Results

Rating the Characteristics

Table 1 reports the number of respondents for the rating and ranking scales.

Insert Table 1 about here

A series of analyses of variance was performed with the data obtained from the rating scale. In each case, the dependent variable was the mean rating of an individual characteristic and the independent variable was group membership. First, multivariate analysis of variance was used to determine if there were any overall difference in the ratings assigned the characteristics by the various faculty groups. Second, simple analyses of variance were performed to examine differences due to group memberships for the 32 individual characteristics. When the three faculty groups (administrators, chairpeople, and teaching faculty) were compared, only three of the 32 characteristics resulted in a significant main effect due to group membership. For all analyses, a probability of .05 was used to determine if an observed difference was considered significant. The results indicate that the perceptions of the importance of individual characteristics generally were similar among faculty groups.

When male teachers were compared to female teachers, none of the 32 characteristics resulted in a significant main effect due to sex. There were also no overall significant differences when participants were grouped by content

area or by hearing status. An analysis of the effect of experience was not possible since there was an insufficient number of faculty in the less-experienced group to allow for comparison.

The faculty groups were combined in the comparison with students. A multivariate analysis of variance resulted in an overall difference between the ratings assigned the 32 characteristics by faculty and the ratings assigned the characteristics by students ($p < .01$). Table 2 presents the mean ratings for each of the characteristics for students and faculty. Significant differences were observed in the means for 16 of the 32 characteristics. The mean ratings for three characteristics (is knowledgeable of world events; knows students and teaches them in ways which they learn best, and walks around the classroom while lecturing) were higher for the student respondents while the remaining thirteen characteristics with significant differences between the two groups received higher mean ratings from faculty respondents. The largest difference between the means of faculty and student ratings ($p < .001$) was observed for involves students in learning activities (faculty = 5.60, students = 4.56); encourages questions (faculty = 5.33, students = 4.49); and enjoys teaching (faculty = 5.74, students = 4.96). Rated highly by both faculty and students were: 1) emphasizes important information in the class; 2) shows a caring attitude about student progress; 3) knows the subject well; 4) gives clear lectures; 5) uses visual materials; 6) uses sign language clearly; and 7) communicates expectations and assignments clearly. Three of the six teaching characteristics receiving the lowest ratings from students were related to their involvement in the teaching-learning experience (involves students in learning activities, encourages group work, and encourages questions).

Insert Table 2 about here

The authors are aware of the problems inherent in multiple t-tests and we acknowledge the possibility that some of the significant differences observed in the rating of individual items could have occurred by chance. However, due to the exploratory nature of this study, we were not yet ready to combine individual items into subscales. Additionally, we did not want to lose the richness and "feel" for the data that comes from examining item level differences.

Ranking the Characteristics

As described earlier, the ranking procedure involved the identification by each respondent of ten characteristics considered most important out of the 32 items. The respondent then ranked the top three out of the ten they identified. A mean weighted-ranking score was computed for each teaching characteristic by assigning four points to the characteristic selected as the highest in importance, three points if it were chosen second in importance, two for third in importance, and one point was assigned to each of the remaining characteristics selected in the top ten. Generally, student priorities were distributed over a larger range of characteristics as compared to faculty. As shown in Table 3, all four groups of respondents ranked highest in importance the characteristic knows the subject well. Also in the top ten for all groups were understands deafness, deaf people and Deaf culture; challenges students' thinking; uses sign language clearly; and communicates expectations and assignments clearly. On the other hand, involves students in learning activities was ranked twenty-fifth by the students, encourages students to learn independently sixteenth, and enjoys teaching twenty-ninth while the scores for the teaching faculty for these characteristics

were in the top five. In contrast, the characteristic uses visual materials was ranked second by the students but did not appear in the top ten characteristics ranked by the faculty groups. Lectures at a good pace and makes sure students understand had the sixth-highest ranking score and emphasizes important information in the class had the eighth highest ranking score among the student respondents, but neither appeared in the top ten for the three faculty groups.

Insert Table 3 about here

Case Studies: The Cohort Analysis

An analysis of the ratings of the individual characteristics assigned by the 20 faculty cohorts, their chairpersons, and their students produced results similar to that found in the general data for all faculty and students in the study and is not reported in this paper. When the teachers and their supervisors were compared, the difference between the rating scores for the characteristics averaged about one point, indicating general agreement.

Tables 4 and 5 contain the results of a comparison of the rankings of the faculty cohorts with their chairpersons and students. When the rankings of the 20 teacher-chairperson dyads were evaluated, the highest percent agreement occurred for the characteristic knows the subject well. Four of the six cohorts who selected this characteristic in their top three choices had chairpersons who also included the characteristic in the top three. Aside from this one characteristic, however, there was little correspondence in the ranking data between the academic department chairpersons and the 20 cohorts they supervise. For twelve of the 20 cohorts, no characteristics chosen in the top

three were also selected by their immediate supervisors who observe and evaluate them.

Insert Tables 4 and 5 about here

The percent agreement between the cohorts and their students was computed by dividing the number of times agreement occurred by the total number of possible agreements. The results reveal that the students in this study, when asked to choose from a list of characteristics the three considered most important to their learning, generally do not select the same characteristics as their teachers. Of the students responding to the ranking procedure who were registered in courses taught by the cohorts, two-thirds had no agreement at all with their teachers in regard to the three characteristics selected as highest in importance.

An additional analysis compared the cohorts original top three characteristics identified from their interviews with their choices from the final questionnaire. Only one cohort retained all three of the original characteristics identified in the interview, five retained two, and twelve retained one.

Discussion

Although there is consistency in agreement about the importance of individual teacher characteristics (as determined by the ratings), teachers and their chairpersons often have different perceptions of the characteristics that are "most effective" (as determined by the rankings). Without dialogue between individual teachers and the supervisors who evaluate them, there may be

misunderstandings about why certain strategies are valued or emphasized in the instructional process.

Teachers should also exercise caution in making assumptions about how students view effective teaching. Differences between the perceptions of teachers and their students related to effective teaching are important for us to understand. Faculty and students agree that a teacher should have a mastery of subject matter, understand deafness as an educational condition, establish clear expectations in the course, and be competent in sign communication. However, faculty and students in this study ranked certain characteristics in a strikingly different manner, in particular the importance of such classroom management characteristics as active learning, student-generated questions, the pace of the presentation, and the emphasis on important information. The differing perspectives on these characteristics bear further investigation. Why deaf college students view involvement in activities as less important to their learning may have roots in the way they have been taught previously. There may also be a relationship to the actual effectiveness of teachers to communicate and convince students of its value. Teachers might benefit by asking students what their expectations are in regard to effective teaching and how they perceive they learn best.

How do the characteristics ranked highly by deaf college students in this study compare with those ranked highly by hearing college students? Feldman (1976) synthesized the results of 49 different structured-response and unstructured-response studies which focused on identifying student perceptions of characteristics associated with superior college teaching. He computed standardized ranking scores and reported on the characteristics most commonly ranked highly by hearing college students. In reviewing the results of Feldman's synthesis, both hearing and deaf college students appear to be in

agreement about the importance of most of the characteristics ranked highly by the deaf students in the present study. Lecturing at a good pace may be valued even more highly by deaf students, however, and the enjoyment of teaching by instructors appears to be viewed as less important to the deaf college students. Additional research is needed to substantiate these generalizations. Two characteristics, understands deafness, deaf people, and Deaf culture, and uses sign language clearly are unique to the population of college students on which the present study is focused.

In addition to being asked to rate or rank the characteristics identified by colleagues, faculty responding to the survey in this study were given the opportunity to offer comments concerning their needs in the pursuit of excellence in teaching. One respondent remarked that the organizational climate needs to be structured so as to allow more effective observation and mentoring of classroom teaching. Several suggested that additional faculty development activities be made available to discuss critical assessment of classroom management, learning theory and its applications, and other colleagues explained their views that an institute value on teaching effectiveness above other pursuits is needed. Some faculty described a need for time to reflect on their teaching strategies and philosophies and an actual physical location for informal interaction with their colleagues. The findings in the present study reveal that the priority assigned a given characteristic by both new and veteran faculty are not strongly-held convictions. The changes in priorities of effective teaching characteristics that occurred for the participants, when given an opportunity to examine a broader list generated by their colleagues, indicate that ongoing reflection on their teaching and dialogue with colleagues may be beneficial to the enhancement of teaching and learning. Effective communication as a crucial component of effective teaching was

repeatedly emphasized. Ability to communicate effectively goes beyond formalized sign and oral skills as indicated in the instrument used in this study. A strong faculty development program can facilitate ongoing exchanges as teachers experiment with various strategies and find what works best for them and their students. College teaching and student learning may be enhanced if teachers are given more opportunities to become involved with action-research and other teaching-research activities. Such activities would allow them to systematically investigate the effects on student learning of placing emphasis on certain teaching behaviors or characteristics. Of the 20 teachers randomly selected to be interviewed in this study, 14 (70 percent) responded with interest when asked if they would like to be more involved in research on teaching while 11 (9 percent) of the 120 faculty who participated only in the rating and ranking responded with interest. Perhaps, even the limited involvement of participating in a one-hour interview and the follow-up surveys sparked their desire for more involvement.

Further research on teaching effectiveness should include the examination of characteristics rated and ranked highly and their relation to student achievement. In studies with hearing students, a number of these characteristics have shown to have strong positive correlations to student learning. For example, rather than using a single rating of overall effectiveness, or a cluster of variables, Feldman (1989) reviewed more than 30 studies examining 31 different dimensions of instruction and which included external measures of student learning developed by people other than the instructors. Statistically-significant correlations were found for such characteristics as the teacher's preparation or organization of the course, stimulation of interest in the subject matter, knowledge of the subject, sensitivity to class level and progress,

enthusiasm about teaching, and clarity and understandableness of the teacher's lectures.

The differences in perceptions of certain characteristics should also be examined to identify reasons why faculty and students feel the way they do. Characteristics viewed as more important by faculty, or by students, merit a closer look, especially in relation to how such different perceptions may relate to a student's motivation to learn. In particular, because of the differences in perceptions between deaf students and their teachers, the involvement of students in learning activities should be further examined. More research is also needed on establishing dialogue between teachers and their supervisors in regard to effective teaching, and how such improved dialogue may have positive influence on the quality of instruction. When perceptual differences occur, as they often do, introspective analysis of dimensions of instruction conducted by teachers and their supervisors may lead to gains in student achievement in academic programs.

Conclusion

As the importance of student participation and interpersonal interaction becomes more manifest in the research literature reporting on studies with hearing students, the perceptions of these constructs and their relationship to achievement among deaf learners should also be investigated. In the education of deaf students, the psychological and sociological underpinnings of the teaching role have not been adequately studied. Although estimates as high as sixty percent of the variance in achievement of hearing students have been attributed to ability (Uguroglu & Walberg, 1978), the individual professor can be expected to be accountable for a sizable portion of the remaining variance, particularly in terms of quality of instruction, time-on-task, and

motivational characteristics. While one of the most obvious limitations of the present study is its focus on perceptions, the results generally agree with those found in the literature on hearing students and indicate that analytical and descriptive teaching research studies, as well as action research, examining the relationship of high-priority characteristics to learning outcomes, may shed light on what constitutes effective teaching of deaf students.

Bibliography

- Donald, J. G. (1986). Knowledge and the university curriculum. Higher Education, 15, 267-282.
- Feldman, K. A. (1976). The superior college teacher from the students' view. Research in higher education, 5, 243-288.
- Feldman, K. A. (1989). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. Research in higher education, 30, 583-645.
- McLean, D. F. (1979). The effect of midsemester feedback upon weekly evaluations of university instructors. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Western Ontario.
- Murray, H. G. (1985). Classroom teaching behaviors related to college teaching effectiveness. In J. G. Donald and A. M. Sullivan (Eds.). Using research to improve teaching. New directions for teaching and learning, No. 23. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sheffield, E. F. (1974). Teaching in the university: No one way. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Uguroglu, M. E., & Walberg, H. J. (1978). Motivation and achievement: A quantitative synthesis. American Educational Research Journal, 16, 4, 375-389.

Table 1

Number of Respondents to Rating and Ranking Scales

	Total Surveys Sent	Rating Scale No. (%) Responding	Ranking Scale No. (%) Responding	Both Scales No. (%) Responding
Administrators	7			7 (100 %)
Chairpersons	19			18 (94.7%)
Cohorts (Interviewees)	20			20 (100 %)
Teaching Faculty	120	32 (53.3 %)	34 (56.7 %)	
Students	167	71 (42.5 %)		
	167		63 (37.7 %)	

Table 2.
Mean Rating Scores for Teacher Characteristics.

CHARACTERISTIC	FACULTY/n=77	STUDENTS/n=71
1. knows the subject well	5.71	5.01***
2. treats students as adults	5.14	4.89
3. has a good sense of humor	4.61	4.71
4. understands deafness, deaf people, and Deaf culture	5.16	4.84
5. challenges students' thinking	5.33	4.94**
6. is on time for class	4.75	4.56
7. encourages students to learn independently	5.25	4.87**
8. asks good questions in class	5.11	4.99
9. is well organized	5.22	5.04
10. is knowledgeable of world events	4.20	4.67*
11. relates the course material to the experiences of the students	4.96	4.83
12. emphasizes important vocabulary in the course	5.12	4.89
13. involves students in learning activities	5.60	4.56***
14. communicates expectations and assignments clearly	5.72	4.99***
15. emphasizes important information in the class	5.37	5.15
16. shows a caring attitude about student progress	5.44	4.99**
17. encourages group work	4.24	4.54
18. is flexible (not overly strict)	4.48	4.51
19. lectures at a good pace and makes sure students understand	5.00	4.96
20. is friendly and easy to talk to	4.89	5.11
21. helps with communication among oral and signing students	4.95	4.93
22. walks around the classroom while lecturing	2.82	3.51**
23. uses visual materials (overheads, blackboard, handouts, etc)	5.37	5.01*
24. uses sign language clearly	5.38	5.01*
25. respects students as individuals who can contribute to the course	5.32	4.87**
26. enjoys teaching	5.74	4.96***
27. knows students and teaches them in ways which they learn best	4.36	4.81*
28. encourages questions	5.33	4.49***
29. gives clear lectures	5.26	4.94
30. speaks clearly	4.95	4.61
31. uses facial expressions	5.31	4.66***
32. encourages student to freely express their ideas and opinions	5.32	4.75**

* Indicates significant differences between faculty and students *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 3.
Rank Order and Mean Weighted Ranking Scores for Teaching Characteristics

Administrators n=7	Academic Chairpersons n=18	Teaching Faculty n=54	Deaf College Students n=63
Knows The Subject Well (2.71)	Knows the Subject Well (2.24)	Knows the Subject Well (2.10)	Knows the Subject Well (1.08)
Uses Sign Language Clearly (1.43)	Enjoys Teaching (1.82)	Enjoys Teaching (1.57)	Uses Visual Materials (0.95)
Communicates Expectations and Assignments Clearly (1.29)	Understands Deafness, Deaf People and Deaf Culture (1.24)	Uses Sign Language Clearly (1.10)	Understands Deafness, Deaf People and Deaf Culture (0.94)
Understands Deafness, Deaf People and Deaf Culture (1.14)	Involves Students in Learning Activities (1.24)	Encourages Students to Learn Independently (1.10)	Communicates Expectations and Assignments Clearly (0.86)
Challenges Students' Thinking (1.14)	Uses Sign Language Clearly (0.88)	Involves Students in Learning Activities (1.08)	Uses Sign Language Clearly (0.83)
Involve Students in Learning Activities (1.14)	Shows a Caring Attitude About Student Progress (0.76)	Challenges Students' Thinking (1.00)	Lectures at a Good Pace and Makes Sure Students Understand (0.75)
Encourages Students to Learn Independently (1.00)	Communicates Expectations /Assignments Clearly (0.71)	Understands Deafness, Deaf People and Deaf Culture (0.94)	Challenges Students' Thinking (0.71)
Is Well Organized (0.86)	Encourages Students to Learn Independently (0.71)	Shows a Caring Attitude About Student Progress (0.92)	Emphasizes Important Information in the Class (0.70)
Enjoys Teaching (0.71)	Is Well Organized (0.53)	Is Well Organized (0.76)	Is Friendly and Easy to Talk To (0.62)
Shows a Caring Attitude About Student Progress (0.57)	Challenges Students' Thinking (0.53)	Communicates Expectations and Assignments Clearly (0.69)	Has a Good Sense of Humor (0.55)

*Mean weighted rank calculated by assigning 4 to the first choice, 3 to the second choice, 2 to the third choice, 1 to other characteristics chosen for top ten, and 0 to all other characteristics.

Table 4.
Analysis of the Rankings of Cohorts and Chairpersons

CHARACTERISTIC	No. Cohorts Selecting Characteristics in Top 3 (N=20)	No. Chairs Selecting Characteristics in Top 3 (N=18)	No. and % Chair/Cohort Dyads Selecting Characteristic in Top 3
1. knows the subject well	6	12	4 (66.7%)
2. treats students as adults	0	1	0
3. has a good sense of humor	0	0	0
4. understands deafness, deaf people, and Deaf culture	8	5	2 (25.0%)
5. challenges students' thinking	4	2	0
6. is on time for class	0	1	0
7. encourages students to learn independently	3	3	0
8. asks good questions in class	2	0	0
9. is well organized	3	2	0
10. is knowledgeable of world events	1	0	0
11. relates the course material to the experiences of the students	2	0	0
12. emphasizes important vocabulary in the course	0	0	0
13. involves students in learning activities	5	5	2 (40.0%)
14. communicates expectations and assignments clearly	1	2	0
15. emphasizes important information in the class	0	0	0
16. shows a caring attitude about student progress	3	5	0
17. encourages group work	0	1	0
18. is flexible (not overly strict)	2	0	0
19. lectures at a good pace and makes sure students understand	0	0	0
20. is friendly and easy to talk to	2	0	0
21. helps with communication among oral and signing students	0	0	0
22. walks around the classroom while lecturing	0	0	0
23. uses visual materials (overheads, blackboard, handouts, etc)	2	0	0
24. uses sign language clearly	6	2	0
25. respects students as individuals who can contribute to the course	3	2	0
26. enjoys teaching	6	9	2 (33.3%)
27. knows students and teaches them in ways which they learn best	0	1	0
28. encourages questions	0	0	0
29. gives clear lectures	0	0	0
30. speaks clearly	0	0	0
31. uses facial expressions	0	0	0
32. encourages student to freely express their ideas and opinions	1	0	0

Table 5.
Analysis of the Rankings of Cohorts and Their Students

CHARACTERISTIC	No. Cohorts Selecting Characteristic in Top 3 (N=20)	No. Students Selecting Characteristic in Top 3 (N=60)	No. and % Cohort/Student Dyads Selecting Characteristic in Top 3
1. knows the subject well	6	15	3 (33.3%)
2. treats students as adults	0	6	0
3. has a good sense of humor	0	5	0
4. understands deafness, deaf people, and Deaf culture	8	14	5 (23.8%)
5. challenges students' thinking	4	8	3 (21.4%)
6. is on time for class	0	3	0
7. encourages students to learn independently	3	5	1 (11.1%)
8. asks good questions in class	2	2	0
9. is well organized	3	5	1 (6.3%)
10. is knowledgeable of world events	1	3	0
11. relates the course material to the experiences of the students	2	5	0
12. emphasizes important vocabulary in the course	0	5	0
13. involves students in learning activities	5	3	0
14. communicates expectations and assignments clearly	1	12	0
15. emphasizes important information in the class	0	10	0
16. shows a caring attitude about student progress	3	4	0
17. encourages group work	0	2	0
18. is flexible (not overly strict)	2	5	0
19. lectures at a good pace and makes sure students understand	0	11	0
20. is friendly and easy to talk to	2	8	1 (11.1%)
21. helps with communication among oral and signing students	0	6	0
22. walks around the classroom while lecturing	0	0	0
23. uses visual materials (overheads, blackboard, handouts, etc)	2	15	2 (50.0%)
24. uses sign language clearly	6	8	2 (13.3%)
25. respects students as individuals who can contribute to the course	3	4	2 (14.3%)
26. enjoys teaching	6	1	0
27. knows students and teaches them in ways which they learn best	0	5	0
28. encourages questions	0	1	0
29. gives clear lectures	0	3	0
30. speaks clearly	0	0	0
31. uses facial expressions	0	5	0
32. encourages student to freely express their ideas and opinions	1	3	0